## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	j	
UNITED STATES OF AM	ERICA, Plaintiff,	Case Number <u>CR-10-00 390</u> DLJ
V. Vesus Valez &	n Ad Defendant	
Wester VILLE N	OMM Defendant.	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
In accordance with	the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.	S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing was held on $(2/2, 20)$
Defendant was present, repr	esented by his attorney $\Lambda$	J. Humy . The United States was represented by
Assistant U.S. Attorney	Danner.	
PART I. PRESUMPTIONS AP		
/ / The defendant i	s charged with an offense d	lescribed in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and the defendant has been
convicted of a prior offense	described in 18 U.S.C. § 31	42(f)(1) while on release pending trial for a federal, state or local
offense, and a period of not i	nore than five (5) years has	s elapsed since the date of conviction or the release of the person
from imprisonment, whichev	er is later.	r and possible of the possible of the possible
This establishes a rel	buttable presumption that n	o condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the
safety of any other person an	d the community.	
/ <del>X</del> /_ There is probabl	le cause based upon (the inc	dictment) (the facts found in Part IV below) to believe that the
defendant has committed an	offense	
A. for which	ch a maximum term of imp	risonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in 21 U.S.C. § 801 et
sė̀q., § 951 e	t seq., or § 955a et seq., OR	
B. under 1	8 U.S.C. § 924(c): use of a	firearm during the cor mission of flory.
This establishes a reb	outtable presumption that no	o condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the
appearance of the defendant a		f the community. JUN - 8 2010
/ / No presumption		
PART II. REBUTTAL OF PRES	UMPTIONS, IF APPLICABLE	RICHARD W. WIEKING
will be ordered detained.	is not come forward with ar	ny evidence to rebut the appropriate operation[s], and he therefore SAN JOSE
	or come forward with avida	
7 7 The detendant ha	is come for ward with evider	nce to rebut the applicable presumption[s] to wit:
Thus, the burden of pr	roof shifts back to the Unite	ed States.
PART III. PROOF (WHERE PE	RESUMPTIONS REBUTTED OF	r Inapplicable)
/ / The United States	s has proved to a preponder	rance of the evidence that no condition or combination of
conditions will reasonably ass	ure the appearance of the de	efendant as required, AND/OR
/ / The United States	has proved by clear and co	onvincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions
will reasonably assure the safe		
		F OF REASONS FOR DETENTION
/ The Court has tak	en into account the factors	set out in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and all of the information submitted
at hearing and finds as follows	The alfendo	wy is Charged w/ Violation J 21 USC
5846, 841(a)(1) +	841 (6) (1) (A) (V	Wini Chunto 1, 4 and 6 +a.
frefeture arin	<u> </u>	
/ / Defendant, his atto	orney, and the AUSA have	waived written findings.
PART V. DIRECTIONS REGARD		•
The defendant is committed	ed to the custody of the Att	orney General or his designated representative for confinement in a
corrections facility separate to the	extent practicable from per	sons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending
appeal. The defendant shall be aff	forded a reasonable opportu	mity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a
court of the United States or on the	e request of an attorney for	the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall
deliver the defendant to the United	States Marshal for the purp	pose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.
241/1/12		(a) him y A / De
Dated: (0 /8//0		XJULICAV. Mimble
<b>,</b> •		PATRICIA V TRIMBIII I

United States Magistrate Judge

AUSA \_\_\_, ATTY \_\_\_\_, PTS